

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### Status of Claims

Claims 6-9, 12 and 14 have been cancelled.

Therefore, claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13 and 15-18 are under consideration in this application.

### Office Action of July 7, 2009

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action, and Applicant hereby requests entry of this Response and further consideration of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeCarmo in view of Hancock et al and further in view of Crawford.

Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection and requests reconsideration thereof.

#### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 requires, in part, that "wherein control programming operates the computer to generate and display a wizard-type interface in an interactive format, in which a human oriented set of questions in general terms are displayed, said user input responsive to answered ones of the questions dictates subsequent ones of the questions, and a level of locking is recommended accordingly". This feature is disclosed throughout the specification, for example, at page 10, lines 6-20.

This requirement of claim has some similarities to the previous requires of claim 6 (now cancelled), and the rejection of claim 6 in the Office Action alleges that:

Regarding claim 6, when read in light of claim 2, regarding limitation "said user input comprises user responses to a series of on-screen questions", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to alter the parental control set-up taught by presenting the viewer with the questions implied by the menu screen. For example, in figure 1 DeCarmo is implicitly asking "Which category would

"you like?" to the user. In figure 6, after a user has selected "By Ratings" in figure 5, the implicit question is "Which ratings would you like to allow?". Examiner takes official notice that it was well known, and obvious, to simplify the selection process even further by displaying those questions which are implied by each menu screen.

However, it is submitted that the "wizard-type interface in an interactive format" requirement of claim 1 set forth above is not explicitly or implicitly disclosed by DeCarmo, neither Hancock et al nor Crawford.

It might be true as the Examiner indicated that figures 1, 5 and 6 of DeCarmo are implicitly asking questions to the user. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that those questions do not constitute a "wizard-type interface" and they are not in an "interactive format". More specifically, the user input responsive to the answered ones of the questions "implicitly asked" by the figures of DeCarmo does not dictate the subsequent ones of the questions. In addition, in accordance to DeCarmo, no recommended level of locking would be presented to the user after any of the questions is answered. Instead, the users would have to complete the locking level configurations on their own, without the assistance of a "wizard-type interface".

In contrast, the present invention provides an even simpler and more automated way for the parental lock configuration. For example, as described in the specification, the wizard might begin by asking if any of the users of the system are children. If all of the users are adults, the program might then simply recommend that all devices be unlocked. On the other hand, if the user indicates that a child or children will be using the system, the wizard may then query as to the children's ages. After the children's ages are entered by the user, the wizard may then recommend locking all programming which correspond to the age of the youngest child. For, example, if a user indicates that there are children under the age of 13, the user interface could then suggest that all programs rated for audiences 13 and older be locked.

It is therefore submitted that the cited references, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of DeCarmo, Ward and Hancock set forth in the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 10, 11, 13 and 15-18

Claims 2-5, 10, 11, 13 and 15-18, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons stated above with regard to the patentability of claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13 and 15-18 are in condition for allowance and entry of the present amendment and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (770-246-2599) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

No additional fees are believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, including any necessary extensions of time, which are hereby requested to Deposit Account No. 50-4290.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Young.  
By his Representatives,

Wang Law Firm, Inc.  
4989 Peachtree Parkway, Suite 200  
Norcross, GA 30092  
Telephone: 770-246-2599  
Fax: 770-216-1630

//lkw//

Date October 5, 2009

---

Filed by Li K. Wang  
Reg. No. 44,393